



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,852	07/09/2003	Malcolm Reginald Hallis Bell	1193-4049	1841
27123	7590	11/14/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.				SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER				ART UNIT
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101				PAPER NUMBER
				3653

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,852	BELL ET AL.
	Examiner Jeffrey A. Shapiro	Art Unit 3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/5/06.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molbak (US 6,494,776 B1) in view of Dobbins et al (US 5,730,272). Molbak discloses, as described in **Claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 21 and 27**, several automatic coin counting devices (100), each with a coin acceptor (1872), said coin acceptor connected with and communicating over a network through network interface/communication means (1826, 1828). See also col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 5 and col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 61. See also figures 2, 18a and 18b.

Molbak does not expressly disclose, but Dobbins discloses a currency acceptor (10) having a sensing means (see Dobbins, elements 21, 22, 24 and 25 and col. 6, lines 60-66), processing means (35), said processing means sending an alarm upon detection of a fraud attempt, said alarm causing said processor to modify its acceptance criteria. See Dobbins, col. 2, lines 14-18 and col. 7, lines 1-59, noting in particular col. 7, lines 44-60.

Dobbins also discloses, as described in **Claims 2-6, 9-13, 15-19, 22-26 and 28-32**, said condition comprises at least one of the sensed parameters since inductive sensor (26) senses coin parameters including diameter and material. Additionally, as

described, for example, in col. 2, lines 15-17 and col. 7, lines 12-30, the window of an acceptance region of genuine coins is made smaller so as to segregate and therefore increase the rejection of fraudulent coins.

Both Molbak and Dobbins are considered to be analogous art because they both concern currency discrimination systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace Molbak's currency discrimination system with that of Dobbins' discrimination system and method of rejecting non-genuine coins upon detection of a fraud attempt, causing the acceptance criteria/acceptance window to be changed so as to screen out said non-genuine coins. See Dobbins, cited above. Note that it would have also been obvious to communicate said information over Molbak's communication means since Molbak's system discloses such communication between the coin acceptor and the central computer facility. See Molbak Claim 1, for example.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve acceptance and rejection of coins, including an improved rate of rejection by modifying the acceptance criteria. See Dobbins, col. 2, lines 8-15. Note also that Molbak describes providing modem communications for uploading or downloading data in col. 12, lines 11-21, of which acceptance alarms and currency discriminator acceptance criteria is considered to be such data which can be easily communicated through a modem connection to a central computer. It also would have been obvious to have one acceptor alert Molbak's other acceptors to an attempt of fraud in one acceptor, thereby causing other acceptors to narrow their acceptance windows, as taught by Dobbins.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 9/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants assert that Molbak does not teach, disclose or suggest a communication means with communication from acceptor to acceptor. However, as exemplified by Independent Claim 1, line 7-9, note the use of the phrase "adapted to" followed by "send alarm signals from the acceptor and receive alarm signals from other acceptors via the network." Because the claim language is "adapted to", Molbak's communication means can meet this claim language simply by being *adapted to* perform the required sending of the alarm signals. Nonetheless, even if this claim language was positively recited, Molbak still discloses, teaches and suggests Applicants' system as claimed.

In fact, since Molbak discloses a central computing facility, such as described at col. 18, lines 57-60, that communicates with many coin counters/sorters, it would have been obvious for Molbak's acceptors to communicate with each other. It is well-known in the computer communication art that modems such as Molbak's element (1826) are adapted for both sending and receiving signals from one computer to another. Further, note that Molbak expressly discloses at col. 12, lines 11-15, that modem (1826) can be used to both upload and download information. Each coin counter/sorter has a coin acceptor. Each of Molbak's acceptors are controlled by a computer processor (1812).

The acceptor (1872) passes information from it to an I/O board (1842), to processor (1812), through modem (1826) and to a central computer facility. The computer facility is disclosed as sending information to or receiving information from a

particular remote coin acceptor. See col. 17, line 65-col. 18, line 60. At col. 18, lines 7-12, Molbak discloses that communication between the central computer and the various acceptors can be performed by network or LAN. This also suggests that acceptors have the ability to and are adapted to communicate with each other.

Dobbins teaches the use of other acceptors in other coin sorters can similarly handle data either uploaded to or downloaded from the central computer facility. This combined with the fact that Molbak discloses uploading/downloading various information including maintenance information, status of information requiring attention, and software downloads. See Molbak, col. 18, lines 30-38. For example, it would have been obvious to cause one acceptor to download a copy of its software onto another acceptor using the modem and LAN to communicate. Note Applicants' figure 1, which illustrates several acceptors with communication lines to a box. This suggests a similar structure as Molbak, which has a central computer facility through which messages are exchanged. Further, it would have been obvious to use the central computer to communicate with other acceptors in order to alert other acceptors to a fraud attempt, and therefore cause the other acceptors to accordingly reduce their window of acceptance, as taught by Dobbins. Therefore, based upon Molbak's and Dobbins' teachings and disclosures, one of ordinary skill and knowledge would have been led to cause Molbak's coin acceptors to communicate fraud alarm information, as taught by Dobbins, to and from the central computer facility or to other acceptors directly.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAS 

November 11, 2006



PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600